

1922

File No. 432-22

Previous Entries.

(*ongrai*)

May 432-22-1-2

Serial Nos. 3-7

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 5

Part B for *September 1925*

SUBJECT

*Levy fees for Mangalarathi in the
Sri Gali Aujaneya Swami temple on
the Mysore Road, Bangalore & Sri Subrah-
manya Swami temple at Ramanatha-
pur.*

*To
Muz Commr No 262 of 30.9.25*

*records with certain
observations to Muz Commr*

WM.

6.11.25

MUZRAI SECRETARIAT.

(Muzrai)

NOTES.

File No. 432-22.

FILE HEADING

Grant of fees for the performances of *Abangalawathi* in the
Yei Yali Anjaneya Temple on the Mysore Road, Bangalore,
& in the Yei Yalashamany Yummi Temple at Ramnathapur.

From

The Muzrai Yummi in Mysore.

No 1715/22-23. Dated 8.5.24

Received 13.5.24.

Diary No. 2202

Enclos. 1 file. Spare Copies.

Serial No 3

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Reports that the complaint against the Archak of the Yei
Anjaneya Temple is the outcome of misunderstanding between
the Archak & the Yummi & that as regards the Ramnathapur tem-
ple a sum of 4 annas is being levied for every *Abangal-*
awathi other than the prescribed one in pursuance of instructions
from the Yummi of Yei Yalashamany Naradinhadraswami
of *Yalashamany* who has been managing the temple for the past 25

NOTES AND ORDERS.

from as the cash grant was found insufficient to meet
all expenses of the *archak*.

The previous file is put up for *refco*.
Undt with a draft *y.o.* recording.

MM 84
16.5.24 17/5/24

Fair draft as revised
17/5/24

Serial
No.

7am draft order

MV. 2/5

28.5.24. 21/5/24

in affluence

22 524

546
26.5

2nd member)

to the temple as a
temple as a member of the
private club (as stated in the
letter to the committee) and a
member of the club. It is a private club
where the members get the best food for
12-15 p.m. and a good 4-5 p.m. to 6 p.m.
to 7 p.m. of the grass in the field for
the temple and the committee as
a club member and a private member.

It is a private club, but
the temple is interested in
it and the temple is interested in
the temple and the committee of the
temple and the committee of the temple.

23
24/5

24/6

24/6

The temple expenses

cash
grants

Serial
No.

grant of Rs 566-14-0 per year
from Govt. and is therefore a Muz
Inst. and a private temple
The local officers simply say that
it has been under the manage-
ment of the Swni of the Subrahmanya
Mutt for the last 25 years. If
aff? the circumstances under which
it came under the Swni control
^{will} be ascertained by a report to
the Mus. Com.

BB
4.6.24

4.6.24

63
56

2nd member)

(A/ Yes - A report may
be called for in the form
also as to the nature and
the Swni's authority in
recovery of the fee in question

dy
CS/6

snapt letter sent

MRV.

24.6.24

BB

25/6/24

Issue

28.6.24

Serial
No.

4 In the Mysore Commr. No. 102. G. 7. 24.
Enquiries under what circumstances the
charge in the case under the Mysore Com-
mission & on what authority the Mysore
Commissioner authorised the recovery of the fees in
question.

8/1

5 From the Mys. Comr.,
letter no. C. 1714 of 22-23 & 3-1-25
Forwards two old documents relating
to the years 1833 & 1859 showing that the
temple was being managed by the Math at
that time and that the original documents
stated to be with the Swamigal, have been
called for & will be sent up
to Govt for perusal after their receipt.

The documents sent up go to show
that the temple at Rameswaram is
has been under the management of
the Sri Subrahmanya Math for a long
time - If approved, the receipt of the
documents called for by the Mysore Com-
missioner will be sent.

80
9-1-25 The documents produced show
by the Mysore Comr. Show clearly
-ently clearly that the temple
(the Mysore Comr.) has been
for many years under the manage-
ment of the Swamigal of the
Sri Subrahmanya Math.

And the non production of the
originals of the documents in
this matter, ~~do~~ for any cause,
does not alter this fact. So long
as the Swamikal has been managing
matters the affairs of the temple, satisfactorily,
there will be no question of the
temple being taken over by
Govt.
Compt.

The point under consideration now
is the levy of a fee for managing the
temple. The Swamikal is said to have lived
the extra fee in order to meet the
temple expenses as the Cash grant
of Rs 66-14-0 per year is not sufficient.

In another file regarding the (Muz 28-22)
28-12
Mahasamadhana at this temple,
which has been subd. yesterday,
there is a scale of income and
expenditure given which shows that
the temple affairs are being managed
properly.

Draft regarding the paper is
sent for approval or other orders.

Ed
9-1-25 and merit
40-1-25

Serial
No.

It is better to obtain the papers referred to & also the authority for the levy of additional fees by the Saramangala. If Govt. permission has not been taken, the fee should either be formally sanctioned or abolished.

10.12.25

The further cons? promised by the
Muz. cons? may ~~be~~ be awaited.

22

10.1.25

10.1.25

6

From, The Muzrai Cons.

Letter no. 1414 dt 27.7.25.

Forwards Hassan Dy. Commr.
Letter stating that as the Secretary
of the Muzrai says that it was
not possible to find the document
though a search was made
for it, it cannot be submitted.

Submitted.

AL

29.7.25

A 2nd. Dy. Commr. according
is a ...
submitted ...

waited upon
the 1857
scouting.

2.8.25

ROUTINE NOTES.

Not to be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

Mar. 7. 4.32 - 1922 re
Sri Subrahmanya Swamy ^{Wiggle}
at Ramana Thpura in the
Prakalpa Jalusa.

In the Ven. records
connected with this case,
There are copies of
Documents of the years
1833, (Vijaya), 1859 (Siddhanti), and 1866.

The Assn Secretary desires
to know whether there
is reference to these
3 documents in the un-
authenticated origl. docu-
ments available in the Ven.
records of the Sect
and if so, copies of these
may be sent up for
his perusal.

N.B. - Should routine notes be written on small slips
the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on
this form
WD 1660-CPR-1 50 000-2, 21

AV
10.8.25. To the Vinsaffahan
Records & Comptroller
B. 10/8/25

V.A. 21
10.8.25

Serial
No.

no
necessity

There is nothing in the Muz Reg? or in the Muz Manual authorizing the payment of a Muz fee to levy such fees without the previous sanction of Govt. Day 1/2/22

Bd.

24-1-22

Strictly speaking the Swami can not levy additional fees without obtaining the sanction of Govt. But has been done to augment the resources of the temple and as it is levied only during Jatra time & cannot possibly work as a hardship on the people, it may be approved now & the Swami told that no innovation should be made without the sanction of Govt.

26/8/22

(Rev. Reg) It is the practice in the present

tribulations to levy some Kanku for Mangalavathi & and when the Swami pay the same voluntarily, there would be no objection but no duty of compulsion should be imposed. With this observation the papers may be returned - WD 6561-GPB-3750-1822 for the Govt. approval of the arrangements.

NOTE—Contn sheet

28/3/9

1/11/22

2/9/22

Serial
No

I agree with the fact
Dropt down my work for on account of
I have to go to school

22

22

✓ 9/11

DPT Submitter

AP 8.9.1825

22/9 9-25

✓ 10 9-25

Rev Secy) 18th meeting h
20/9

Dropt down

✓ 21/9 25

24/9

7 To. Muz Comm.
No 362 of 30.9.25

Records with the
observation that while there
is no objection to the receipt of the
Ranik's paid by the Government
family, no sort of compulsion should
be exercised in levying them

H.V

Please note
the ~~etc~~ & books
not - from the
V2 ~~the~~

from

Sent -
RS

9/11

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Dated Bangalore, 8th M a y 1924.

C1714/22-23
Encl one file

From

K. Chandy, Esquire., B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

B a n g a l o r e.

Muz
11 MAY 1924

11 MAY 1924
MUZRAI

To

V. Anantaraman, Esquire., B.A., *Muz. 432-22-3.*

Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Revenue Department.

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No.2940/Muz.432-22-2 dated the 4th -
June 1923 forwarding for report an abstract from the newspaper Sampad-
abhyudaya dated the 21st May 1923 regarding the demand of fees for --
performing ⁿmaṅgalarthi in the Sri Gali Anjaneya temple, Mysore Road --
Bangalore and Sri Subramanyaswami temple at Ramanathpur, I have the --
honor to submit herewith copies ^{of letters} as noted in the margin received from --
Letter* No.D₂ Dis.990/23-24 dated 30-1-24.) the Deputy Commissioner's
From ^{the} Deputy Commissioner Bangalore (S) of Bangalore and Hassan --
No.644/22 dated 30th April 1924 from Districts and to state that
the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan -- the complaint against the --
District. -----
Archak of Ghali Anjaneya temple which is not a Muzrai institution is --
stated to be the outcome of some misunderstanding between himself and --
the devotees of the temple and with regards to the temple at Ramanathapur
that a sum of Rs.0-4-0 is being levied for every extra maṅgalarthi other
than the usual one to be performed at the request of the devotees, in --
pursuance of instructions from the Swamiṅgalu of Sri Sampushta Narasimha
Swami Matt of Subrahmanya in whose manasement the temple of Sri Subramanya
Swami at Ramanathpur is for the last 25 years to meet the expenses of the
institution, the cash grant of Rs.570/- per annum being found insufficient
to meet all the expenses in the institution.

The enclosures received with the letters referred to above are

herewith submitted for reference and kind return.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai

Muzrai Commissioner.

PK

KSR.

SUBJECT

Diary No. of letter replied to 2202

Muzrai Secretariat

()

, the 192 .

Section Muz.

File No. 432-22.

Serial No. 4.

No. 14
one file

Date of issue 4.7.24

To

The Muzrai Commⁿ in.
Deu

Signed by Mst Ramaiya

Siv,

Adverting to your letter No
4.1714/22-23 d. 8.5.24 reporting
that a sum of 4 annas is being
in ~~the~~ the Yar Yubrahmanaswami
temple at Yubrahmanaswami
temple for the temple at Yubrahmanaswami
in pursuance of instructions from
the Yuvamigal of the Yar Yubrahmanaswami
Mandir at Yubrahmanaswami, I am directed to enquire
under what circumstances the
over. institution

came under the Guam's management
and on what authority the Guamigalu
authorised the recovery of the fee in
question.

The inclosure received with your letter
me herewith returned for reply, as follows.

I have etc.,

28 6 24
Secretary to Govt,
Revenue Dept.

2576124

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

14/22-23 Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.
one one with one file

Dated Bangalore, 3rd January 1925.

From

K. Chandy, Esquire., B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,


B a n g a l o r e.

To K. V. Anantaraman, Esquire., B.A.,

Secretary to the Government of

His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Revenue Department.



8-JAN 1925
MUZRAI
Dno 1111
Muz 432-22-5

S7
m11 s With reference to your letter No.14/M.F.432-22-4 dated the --
4th July 1924 enquiring under what authority the management of the
Sri Subramanyaswami temple at Ramanathapur came under the management
of the Swamigalu of Sri Sampushta Narasimhaswami Matt at Subramanya,
I have the honor to forward herewith copy of letter No.R.H.C.644-22
dated the 20th December 1924 received from the Deputy Commissioner -
Hassan District submitting two documents relating to the years 1833
and 1859 where from it will be seen that the temple was being managed
by the matt at that time.

The Deputy Commissioner has been asked to obtain and send up
the original documents(referred to as being with the Swamigalu)----
transferring the management of the temple to the Swamigalu. On --
receipt they will be submitted for the perusal of Government.

The enclosures received with the Deputy Commissioners letter
under reference are herewith submitted for perusal and kind return.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

KSR.

for Muzrai Commissioner.

Absent from duty

[Signature]

No.R.H.C.644-22 dated 19/20th December 1924 from the
Commissioner, Hassan District to the Muzrai Commissioner in

In reply to your letter No.C.1714 of 22-23 dated 11th/12th
July 1924 forwarding copy of Revenue Secretary's letter No.14/M.F.
432-22-4 dated 4th July 1924 calling for a report re: the transfer
of the management of Sri Subramanya Swami temple at Ramanathapur to
the Swamigalu of Sri Sampusta Narasimhaswami Mutt at Subramanya, I have
the honor to state that the Sub Division Officer Holenarasipur Sub --
Division has sent two old documents relating to the years 1833 and -
1859.

2. From these two documents it is seen that the Swamigalu of Sri
Sampusta Narasimhaswami Mutt was managing the institution even at that
time. The Sub Division Officer further reports that the Parapathegar
and the Dharmadarsis of the temple have informed that the original --
documents transferring this institution to the Mutt are with the ----
Swamigalu. The Amildar of Arkalgud Taluk has written to the Swamigalu
in the matter and no reply is received yet in the matter.

3. Again the Sub Division Officer, Holenarsipur has been asked to
day to get those documents early and submitted the same to this office.

4. The file of vernacular papers ending with the Hole Narsipur Sub
Division officer's No.H.C.143-23 dated 15th December 1924 is herewith
sent."

"C o p y"

V. G. C. C. C.
For Muzrai Commissioner. 6/11

M

KSR.


Letter No.H.C.644-22 dated 29/30th April 1924 from the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

"In reply to your letter No.C.1714/22-23 dated 23rd January 1924 calling for a final report in the matter of levying fees for the performance of mangalarathi, in the Sri Subramanya Swami temple at Ramanathpur, I have the honor to state that the Amildar Arkalgud Taluk was directed to ascertain the authority for levying the fees from the Swamigalu of Sri Samputa Narasimha Swami Matt at Subramanya. The Amildar has sent in reply the yadi received from the Swamigalu, wherein it is seen that no fee is levied for ordinary Mangalarathi in the temple but a fee of 4 as ~~it~~ only levied when devotees want the Mangalarathi to be performed specially on their own account. Out of the 4 as. received, one anna is taken by the Archak and the rest -- goes towards the funds of the institution.

2. The levy of the fees was ordered nearly 25 years back by Sri Vyasathirtha Sri Sri Padanjalavaru as the grant was not enough for -- the expenditure and that there is also an entry under the signature of the Swamigalu in the scale book of the institution, on 19th November 1898, authorising the levy of the fees. Further it is seen that no Government order has been received re: the levy of fees since this is a private institution.

3. The vernacular file of records ending with the Holenarsipur Sub Division Officer's No.R.H.C.143-23 dated 19th April 1924 is herewith sent for reference and return."

"Copy"



Jm Muzrai Commissioner.
PK

16/5/24

KSR.

Letter No.D2 Dis.990/23-24 dated 30th January 1924 from the
Commissioner Bangalore, District to the Muzrai Commissioner
in Mysore.

(17)

"With reference to your letter No.C.1714 of 1922-23 dated 12
13th June 1923 calling for a report re the article in Sampadabhudya
dated 21st May 1923 complaining that a fee of six pies is levied by
the Pujari of the Sri Gali Anjaneyaswami temple on the Mysore Road,
Bangalore, for the performance of Mangalarathi in the temple, I have
the honor to forward herewith the correspondence ending with the --
Bangalore Sub-Division Officer's Yadi No.H.C.941 of 1922-23 dated --
26th October 1923 and to state that the temple in question is not a
Muzrai Institution. The Anchak who was sent for by the Amildar has
denied the allegation and stated that the complaint is due to mis-
understandings between some of the devotees and himself. Though
the temple is not a Muzrai Institution, the Pujari of the temple has
been instructed not to give room for such complaints."

"Copy"

[Signature]
for Muzrai Commissioner. 10/5/24
MK

KSR.

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

1714 / n. 25

En 1

Dated Bangalore, 24th July 1925.


27th



C. S. Balasundaram Iyer, Esq., B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

B a n g a l o r e.



The Secretary to the Government

of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,

Revenue Department.

Muz 432-1922

Sir,

With reference to your D.O. letter dated the 23rd March 1925 requesting me to intimate when the original document transferring the management of Sri Subramanyaswami temple at Ramanathpur, ---- Arkalgud Taluk to the Swamigalu of Sri Sampushta Narasimhaswami -- Matt will be obtained and submitted, I have the honor to forward -- herewith copy of letter No. 644/22 dated the 12th July 1925 received from the Deputy Commissioner Hassan District stating that as the Swamigalu says that it was not possible to find the document though a search was made for it, it cannot be obtained.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

C. S. Balasundaram Iyer

Muzrai Commissioner.

KSR.

Letter No.644-22/H.O.dated 11/12th July 1925 from the Deputy
Commissioner, Hassan District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.


"Subject:--Management of Sri Subramanya Swamy temple at
Ramanathapur."

"With reference to your letter No.1714-22 dated 3rd January
1925, requesting me to obtain and forward the original document
from the Swamigalu of Sri Sampushta Narasimhaswamy Matt at Subramanya
transferring to him the management of the Subramanya Swami temple
at Raman athapur, I have the honor to ~~state~~ state that the Sub
Division Officer of Holenarasipur Sub Division reports that he met the

Swamigalu at Ramanathapur on the 24th June 1925, as he had come there
from Subramanya and when he requested him to send the original document
referred to above, the Swamigalu told him that it was not with him and
that a similar reference had been received by him from the Muzrai Com-
missioner also and that he was not ~~able~~ able to find it out though a
search was made for it. The Swamigalu gave me also the same reply when
I happened to meet him at Ramanathapur during my tour last month.

In these circumstances, it has not been possible so far to obtain
the document from the Swamigalu. "

"C o p y"


for Muzrai Commissioner.



Proceedings of the Government of M.V.
the Maharaja of Mysore.

Read.-

Correspondence ending with letter No. C.1714 of 1922-23 dated ^{7.7.23}~~8.7.1924~~ from the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, reporting, with reference to Newspaper abstract from Sampadabhyudaya dated 21-5-1923 complaining of demand of fees for Mangalarathi in Sri Gali Anjaneyaswami temple, Bangalore District and the Sri Subrahmanyaswami temple at Ramanathapur, that the complaint regarding the former is untrue, and that as regards the temple at Ramanathapur ~~the~~ the levy of a sum of annas 4/- for every extra Mangalarathi other than the ordinary one, performed at the request of the devotees, has been authorised by the Swamigalu of the Sri Sampushta Parasimhaswami Mutt at Subrahmanya who has been managing the ~~Sri Subrahmanyaswami temple at Ramanathpur~~ for the past 25 years in order to meet the expenses of the institution as the cash grant of Rs. ⁵⁶⁶⁻⁴⁻⁰~~570~~ per annum is found insufficient to meet the same.

Order No. 362 dated 30th Sept 1924
mur 432-22-7
Recorded. Enc are file. 19

To Mr. S. R. V. Revenue Secretary
The Muz. Commr. in Mysore (returning enclosures)
The Comptroller to Govt.

Rounded with the
 observation that ^{whole} there
 is no objection to the receipt of Kanikas
 being of the Kanika ^{paid by} —
~~in question of the~~
 devotees ^{paying Kanikas for many years} ~~the same~~
 voluntarily ~~that~~ ^{not} that no
 sort of compulsion
 should be exercised in buying it.

10/9/15
 Rev Rec 2
 Bb
 4-9-25

22/9
 1/7

To
 The Mus: Comr Secy. Secy.

21/pages